1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
3	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )
4	) No. CR 06-157 MJP Plaintiff,
5	) vs. )
6	HENRY C. ROSENAU, )
7	Defendant. )
8	)
9	VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
10	OF
11	A DETENTION HEARING
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA, MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	5/4/2011
14	APPEARANCES
15	For Plaintiff: Ye-Ting Woo
16	For Defendant: Craig Platt
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Transcribed from electronic sound recording
22	Transcript produced by transcription service
23	
24	Transcribed by Brian Killgore
25	
	1
	ACF Reporting Services Inc. (206) 467-6188

(Proceedings of 5/4/2011) 1 2 THE CLERK: Your Honor, we are back on the record. 3 The next matter is scheduled as a detention hearing in the 4 United States of America v. Henry Rosenau. The cause number 5 is CR 6-157, a matter assigned to Judge Pechman. Will counsel please make their appearance for the 6 7 record? MS. WOO: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Ye-Ting Woo. 8 9 I am standing in for Susan Roe with the United States Attorney's Office. 10 THE COURT: And Ms. Woo, good afternoon. 11 12 MR. PLATT: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Craig 13 Platt for Mr. Rosenau who is seated to my left. He 14 THE COURT: And Mr. Platt, good afternoon, and Mr. 15 Rosenau, good afternoon. 16 We are here for your detention hearing, and I did 17 receive an updated US Pretrial Services report, and Ms. Woo, 18 is the government still seeking detention in this case? 19 MS. WOO: Yes, we are, Your Honor. Would you like me to approach? 20 21 THE COURT: Sure. 22 And one of the things I am very curious about is this 23 case, I think in a week or so, will literally be five years

MS. WOO: Yes, approximately. It was -- the

24

25

old? And --

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 3

original indictment was returned in May of 2006. The arrest by the defendant occurred on September 21, 2005. This was the arrest by Canadian authorities back in September 2005.

Because I am not the attorney of record on the case, it is my understanding that the extradition has been pending for several years -- because of the fact that the defendant having contesting extradition, and it wasn't until recently when the British Columbia courts, Canada courts issued an order of surrender that he was then escorted by Canadian law enforcement to the border this morning and transferred over to the marshals' custody for transportation to court -- well, not this morning, I'm sorry, on the day of his initial appearance.

So we are seeking that the defendant be detained pending trial. There are a number of reasons that are related to the facts in the case, as well as due to the efforts to extradite him, the many years it has taken for the government to seek his appearance in court in the United States. That has been pending for several years.

I understand that Pretrial Services is recommending release. The one distinction that I would point out to the Court is that this is a rebuttable presumption case. The defendant is seeking a 10 year mandatory minimum on at least count 2 in the indictment; the fact that it is a rebuttable presumption case is not considered by Pretrial Services. It

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 4

is part of their policy not to take that into consideration, so that is one distinction I would point out to the Court.

In this situation, the defendant is a Canadian citizen. The allegations here are -- that come from the underlying extradition record that was discussed before the Court in Canada indicates that during the years 2004 and 2005, that this defendant was involved in flying 29 loads of marijuana from Canada to the United States, totaling between 11,000 and 13,000 pounds of marijuana.

He was the pilot for a helicopter, and he was responsible for those loads, working with co-conspirators whose cases, as I understand it, have now been resolved.

On September 21, 2005, he was arrested by Canadian authorities after he had dropped off a load of 1128 pounds of marijuana, which had been seized on the US side, along with his codefendants were arrested at that time.

When he was arrested by Canadian authorities on September 21, 2005, he had a loaded gun underneath the pilot's seat of his helicopter. He had night vision goggles, satellite phones. He had also taped over one of the letters that are on the helicopter in order to change the letter from an F to a B, as I understand it, in order to prevent identification of that helicopter.

A couple of years ago, as well, he had been interviewed by the previous primary ICE agent in this case, Jesse

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 5

Miller, and he had made a statement to Mr. Miller that he would not make himself available to face charges in the United States, and of course that was I think at the beginning of the extradition proceedings.

He does -- is working, but I also would note that he has access to funds and to assets that if he were to flee or to make himself unavailable in the United States, he has the ability to do that.

He had recent -- well, I suppose it is not recent, but he has had international travel since this case was filed.

I believe he indicated that he went to Costa Rica in 2006 or 2007.

It is interesting to note that his -- I believe it is his girlfriend Veronica Schwartz, had stated that the defendant does not travel internationally, but as this court is aware, this case does involve the defendant traveling internationally on a regular basis, using a helicopter in which he was able to avoid, on a number of instances, any detection by border patrol authorities or transportation authorities.

So for all of those reasons, we would ask the Court to find that there are no factors or combination of factors that would assure his appearance in the United States to face these charges if he were allowed to be released on bond and to return to Canada.

The other risk that we face, of course, is that if the defendant chooses not to return to the United States for any of the future court appearances, we then have to initiate yet another extradition proceeding, which would likely take a lengthy period of time so that the defendant may assert whatever rights he is afforded to in Canada to oppose any warrant that is issued by this court for his arrest for failure to appear on that bond.

So for those reasons, we would ask the Court to permanently detain the defendant pending trial.

THE COURT: Just one point of clarification.

MS. WOO: Yes?

THE COURT: You had indicated there had been prior law enforcement contact, US law enforcement contact with Mr. Rosenau, and there was some kind of conversation about, "I am not going to make myself available." Is this some kind of discussion about him coming back?

MS. WOO: It was -- my understanding is that it was a discussion about him essentially self surrendering -- submitting on the extradition and to come to the United States to face the charges, and that this conversation occurred a couple of years ago, and the defendant indicated to the agent at that time that he did not believe the US had the ability to extradite him, and that he would not voluntarily face the charges in the United States. Thank

you.

THE COURT: And Mr. Platt, go ahead, please.

MR. PLATT: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, before I begin, I would like to address a few facts here, and I still don't have discovery, so to begin with, I would orally renew our request for discovery in this matter. However, I have been in touch with some of the attorneys up in Canada, and with respect to the timeline here, it is my understanding that there was initial contact around the time of the events alleged in 2005.

It is unclear whether or not that was actually a formal arrest or merely an interrogation at that time. What is clear is that there was a superseding indictment issued in 2008 on 9/17.

I have talked to his attorney up there, Gary Botting, who informs me that they were not notified of the charges here, and that actually he was simply arrested without any notice at that time, and that relates to the supervision that has already occurred on this matter as part of the extradition, which I would like to address.

He is maintaining his innocence as far as the allegations made by the government in this case, and we think that is very important here, because the government is saying that under 3142, there is this rebuttable presumption. We feel that we can rebut that presumption

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 8

with the information that is contained in the Pretrial Services report, the information I have for the Court now.

Our request is for personal recognizance under 3142(a)(1), and our position is that this is sufficient for the reasons that we will indicate, and that it is not necessary to have additional conditions, although we have reviewed the conditions proposed by Pretrial Services; they do seem appropriate: Employment, travel restrictions, no contact with witnesses.

Supervision by Pretrial Services is available, which I have confirmed with their office. There is this special program where they can supervise individuals who are residing in Canada, and they have confirmed that they are willing and able to do that.

There is no problem with weapons. He has no weapons at this time. There is no issue whatsoever with drugs or alcohol, all of which is contained in the report, and we would not oppose any other conditions the Court may feel are appropriate.

There are a lot of factors that point to the fact that Mr. Rosenau is not a flight risk, and that he will appear and that these conditions will be sufficient to assure his appearance.

There is no showing that he has ever obstructed justice, that he has ever been violent, that he has

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 9

interfered with witnesses. There is no showing of dangerousness, and there is no showing of failure to comply.

About the only real support for the government's position here is that Mr. Rosenau elected to contest the extradition. That is his legal right to do and that in and of itself is not sufficient as a ground to hold him.

Now Mr. Rosenau has no criminal history whatsoever. He is 60 years old, and he has absolutely nothing in his record to indicate that he would be a flight risk. In fact he is in the unusual position as someone with no prior criminal history -- of having a track record of supervision because of the extradition proceedings, and that track record is 100% positive.

He has lived in -- and I will get back to that at the end here, but he has lived in British Columbia for his entire life, except for one year in Alberta. He attended high school in a town with the name 100 Mile House, where he married his childhood sweetheart at the age of 18. They were married for a lengthy period of time and have separated since, but they remain on good terms, which again speaks to his character.

He has a significant other at this time of almost 10 years, Ms. Veronica Schwartz, referred to by the government as his girlfriend. She is 60 years old and another compelling reason for him not to take off here is that she

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 10

has stage III cervical cancer, and he is assisting with her care.

With respect to employment, he has two different jobs. He works in heavy equipment, which he has done since he was a young man. He is a commercial truck driver. He works for Lomack in the mining business, driving these large trucks up in the outback of British Columbia.

He also works for Mac Track Roadbuilding. His supervisor there, Don McDonald, is actually going to provide a letter of recommendation for him, and he has that job waiting, if he is released.

He has no history whatsoever of involvement with drugs. He is tested by his employer, and so there is verification of that. He has not had any alcohol for nine years. He had quit drinking, not because he had a problem, but as part of an agreement with his significant other so that she would quit smoking and he said he would stop drinking -- but he has no history of alcoholism, no history of counseling, no history of mental health issues.

He has no weapons in his possession, no history of gambling, no domestic violence.

With respect to residence, he would reside at 4605 Highway 97 South -- that is in Quesnel, Q-U-E-S-N-E-L, British Columbia. He has strong family ties in British Columbia. He has a daughter 29 years old, Jacqueline

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 11

Gagnon. I have been in touch with Jacqueline and she does verify that she will support her father if he is released.

He also has a 94-year-old mother, Bessie Higgins, and her husband, John Higgins, who is also basically dying of cancer. He is 84 years old, I think.

As far as financial resources, they are somewhat limited, but our position is that that makes him even less of a flight risk. He doesn't have the means to be able to leave what he has. He does have a residence there that he owns and is in a positive state with the mortgage.

He does have some tools and old vehicles, which again would indicate that he would want to stay there because that is part of his livelihood.

Now back to the supervision. As I said before, this event occurred in 2005. He was arrested on a warrant in 2008. He did have representation recently by Gary Botting, who is an extradition attorney in Canada I have talked with quite a bit.

Mr. Botting confirmed that there was no prior notice of the charges -- and he first found out when he was arrested; however, when he was arrested he obtained counsel and he was advised to contest the extradition, although he was told that there would probably be a minimal chance that he would prevail on that.

He did pursue his remedies, and although he was told

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 12

that he had no real chance, it is not necessarily a flight risk if you avail yourself of legal process. And that is the whole point; he didn't take off. He has had three years to take off and he didn't do it. He stayed around and he availed himself of appropriate legal process with representation.

THE COURT: So just to make clear in my mind, you are saying that in Canada, although there was this arrest warrant and extradition process, that he was actually in the community?

MR. PLATT: That is correct. He was released shortly after the arrest in, I believe, mid-2008, and he was supervised through the RCMP in the Quesnel office. I have contacted them personally; Pretrial Services has also been in contact with them.

I was able to get confirmation of the supervision, although we couldn't get all of the specifics because the person, the staff sergeant responsible is off this week. However, it is clear that he did not take off; that he had to report twice a week for the first year-and-a-half following that arrest; that he had no violations of pretrial or pre-extradition supervision. He also had a curfew from 11:00 until 7:00 in the morning, and was not allowed to stay over anywhere other than his residence unless he gave two days' notice, and that only could be if it was in

conjunction with his work duties.

So he had a perfect track record of supervision, which is highly unusual for someone with no criminal history, but he has had three years to prove himself.

Eventually, these conditions were reduced, because he was doing so well. His adjustment was excellent.

So again, even when the conditions were reduced, he didn't take off. He stuck around, availed himself of legal process.

As the extradition progressed, however, it was pursued through the courts in Canada, as is his right, and ultimately it became clear that he was probably not going to prevail on that.

Now at that point he, instead of taking off, or waiting to be arrested, he made arrangements through counsel to turn himself in to the authorities. I have confirmed that with Mr. Botting.

In addition, I spoke with an attorney from the Canadian Department of Justice, a Mr. Nazub (phonetic), and he was responsible for their end of the extradition proceedings. He personally confirmed to me in a telephone conversation that Mr. Rosenau did in fact turn himself in early; that he was under an order to turn himself in once the extradition remedy was exhausted, and he didn't even wait until the final order; he turned himself in the day before, because he

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 14

didn't want there to be a problem, and Mr. Botting tells me that that involved him driving four-and-a-half hours from his residence down to Vancouver to turn himself in so that he finds himself here today.

So there has been no indication whatsoever of a flight risk.

I know the Court knows this, but our position is that he is innocent. Section 3142 talks about the presumption of innocence. A lot of lawyers are going to say, "If you contest extradition, you are not going to be able to get released afterwards." Our position is that's not right.

The government has indicated it would be difficult, from their point of view, if there were a problem, because they would have to extradite.

And at the risk of going a little far afield, I have to say, under separation of powers, we have three branches -- I have heard commentators talk about three branches being the House of Representatives, the Senate and the White House. That is not the case.

It doesn't matter whether the government is concerned about having to pursue extradition. What matters is whether he is a flight risk. He is not. We ask the Court to release him and follow the recommendation of Pretrial Services. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, and Ms. Woo, any rebuttal

or comments in response?

MS. WOO: Your Honor, I would only comment with respect to the claim of innocence, of course, the defendant is entitled to assert that presumption of innocence. There is, at least with respect to the events on September 21, 2005, there was surveillance of his helicopter arriving in the United States, removal and then seizure of the marijuana, and then immediately after he arrives back in Canada. He is the person who is arrested on that same day in the same helicopter with the items that I have already mentioned, so at least with respect to that, I think that the Court can weigh the evidence in terms of the nature of the offense, and certainly the government considers this to be a very serious offense, which is why we have a mandatory minimum.

With respect to the extradition proceedings, in reviewing the file documents that I have, it appears that the government initiated extradition shortly after the indictment was returned in May of 2006, so as the Court has noted, this has been a matter that has been pending for many years, and we are of course not contesting that the defendant has a right to assert his — the legal process up in Canada, but we are concerned about the fact that he does have the ability, the access and the training to be able to keep himself away from the United States, if he chose to.

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 16

And I am not contesting that he was in compliance in Canada; what I am concerned about is whether or not he will voluntarily make himself available in the United States, and that based on all of the factors that we have taken into consideration, we are not confident that he will do that in the future.

THE COURT: All right, anything to add from US Pretrial Services?

MR. McTIGHE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So Mr. Rosenau, difficult case but I am going to fashion an appearance bond. I am not going to ding you for exercising your right to contest extradition -- it is your legal right -- and I do think that to your favor, while you were facing the extradition proceeding, and knowing that you could be sent back to this country, as your lawyer says, knowing that the boom was lowering and lowering, you didn't run away. You turned yourself in, and here you are before this court.

So I will order that you be released on supervision. You are working and living in British Columbia; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: So I am going to restrict your travel to that province, where you live, and to this federal district, here to Seattle, but only for the purpose of

court. I mean you shouldn't be coming here for other purposes, like a vacation or just for fun.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: You obviously will have court appearances to make, and you will have to limit it only to that.

While you are out, you have to maintain good conduct -whether it is Canadian laws or our laws, state, local,
federal, national laws, you should maintain good conduct.

Is there a travel document that was already confiscated when he turned himself in?

MR. PLATT: No, Your Honor, it is an expired -- expired passport, and I think the arrangement with Pretrial Services is that will be surrendered if he is released.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. PLATT: We can make those arrangements.

THE COURT: Do you have it already or do you know?

MR. PLATT: It would be -- I don't have the authority. It would be in his house up in Canada and when I talked to Pretrial Services this morning, they indicated that it would be acceptable to them if he were directed to return that -- or turn that into them. We could help with

THE COURT: All right.

those arrangements.

Okay, so and in terms of a surrender date, we should

ACE Reporting Services, Inc. (206) 467-6188

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 18

have a date no later than, because I don't want that just to be open-ended.

There is, of course, one sort of potential glitch in that, because you are not a US citizen, we will -- Mr. Platt and Ms. Woo, I don't know if you already know the situation, will he have to process through immigration before actually being released?

I know in the past there have been some defendants who the Court releases, but it might take five days, it might take 10 days, it might take three weeks to actually process through ICE before they are actually returned to their home country. I don't know if either of you are aware of the situation?

MS. WOO: My understanding is if he has the Court's appearance bond -- I don't know what form of ID he has; generally, when Canadians report to court, they do bring their passport, whether expired or not, so I am surprised he didn't have that with him, but for his return to Canada, he needs to have a form of identification. If he does not have that, then he will need to make arrangements to have that before he can get through the border.

THE COURT: He probably has his driver's license or some kind of local --

MS. WOO: Okay.

THE COURT: But I guess my question was in terms

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 19

of setting a date by which he has to turn in his expired passport, is that when I enter an order of release on this criminal matter, that will release him on the criminal matter. But because he is not a US citizen, I don't even know whether -- or whether anyone knows whether there is some other kind of immigration hold, because if there is, it could delay his return to his own country.

MS. WOO: I am not aware of any ICE detainer.

THE COURT: Okay, well why don't we do this: I will set a date, and how much time would be a reasonable timeframe to submit his passport?

MR. PLATT: I am trying to recall the dates.

(Brief pause in proceedings)

THE COURT: All right, so that would be no later than May 18.

MR. PLATT: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I was looking --

THE COURT: Okay, so what we will do is we will surrender your expired passport no later than May 18 to the US Pretrial Services. If we need to change that date because there is some kind of immigration hold up, I am sure the parties will let me know and we can make that adjustment.

MR. PLATT: Your Honor, there is one wrinkle here, and this was actually raised in the interview with Pretrial

Services this morning where I was present.

Mr. Rosenau indicated that his passport was expired and told Mr. Dotson that. If he had it, it is at his house, but he is not totally sure that he still even has it, so that does present a little bit of a problem.

I would have no fashioning the order that he be ordered to turn his passport in if he has one, and notify the authorities if he is unable to locate that. It is expired; he doesn't travel much.

THE COURT: All right, why don't we do it this way: If you have a passport, expired or otherwise, you need to turn it in. If you don't -- if you can't find it, then submit an affidavit to Ms. Busic saying, "I don't have my passport; I cannot find it, or it is lost, or is gone."

 $$\operatorname{MR}.\ \operatorname{PLATT}\colon$$  I can arrange that through his counsel up there.

MS. WOO: Your Honor, I do have an additional request related to travel, because clearly he -- in our case he was traveling to the United States and was not using a passport, was avoiding the customs ports of entry, so regardless of whether he has a passport or not, he has the ability, he had the ability to travel freely internationally.

It is not clear to me if he has a pilot's license. If he does, I would ask that he surrender that; that he not be

allowed to fly any aircraft, any helicopters, anything like that as part of his condition of his bond.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. WOO: Of his bond condition, as well.

THE COURT: Mr. Platt, do you have any objection to that, no flying restriction?

MR. PLATT: Your Honor, Mr. Rosenau has explained to me that he does not have a pilot's license at this time, and our position is simply ordering him not to leave --

THE COURT: Well, if you don't have a license, there is none to surrender, but I will include that as a condition: No operation of aircraft of any kind.

MR. PLATT: No objection.

MS. WOO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Rosenau, you also will have to maintain your residence; not change without preapproval of your supervising officer. And you also shall not possess any dangerous weapons, you know, firearms, explosives, bullets, anything like that. Maintain your employment. And if you become unemployed, you know, actively look for employment.

If you are financially able to contribute to the costs of your supervision, you will be asked to do so, and obviously if you don't, you won't have to.

Within 24 hours of your release, you need to contact

the pretrial office and you will get information today as to how to do that, and if you don't, that will be a violation.

Do you understand that?

And as I understand it, the pretrial office has an office up at the border, and from time to time, at the direction of your officer, you will be meeting at the border with your US pretrial officer.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You shall not have any contact with people connected to your case, involved in your case -- even if their case is over and if they have pled guilty or been convicted, you're not going to be able to call them up and say, "Gee, what happened in your case?" All right?

You have a good lawyer. You let your lawyer do his job, do all the work, do all the investigation, but you need to stay clear. No direct or indirect contact. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And also any witnesses. All right?

If there are any witnesses involved, you are to have no contact whatsoever with them.

All right. And Mr. McTighe, did I miss any of the recommended conditions?

MR. McTIGHE: I don't believe so, Your Honor.

1 (Brief pause in proceedings) 2 MR. PLATT: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: So Mr. Rosenau, did you have enough 4 time to go over your appearance bond with your lawyer? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Well everything that is written here, I am going to comply with. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. And you can see the very first condition is you must make all of your court 8 9 appearances, and your bond says that there is a hearing on June 27 at nine o'clock in courtroom 12B, and it is 10 important because if you willfully fail to make your court 11 12 appearances, the government has the power not only to say, 13 "Gee, you should be arrested immediately," but the 14 government could add additional charges for willfully 15 failing to make your court appearances you could face 16 additional imprisonment, 10 more years on top of whatever 17 you already face. It is a very serious thing. 18 Do you understand that? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Do you have any questions about any of these conditions? 21 22 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: And you promise you will follow these conditions? 24 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It seems you have good legal counsel, both in this country and in Canada. You know that if there is a question, you call your lawyers immediately. You need to look before you leap. If you have a question about supervision, you will have a good supervising officer. Just call them up. Just clear things up rather than getting into trouble, all right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

So Mr. Rosenau, I will sign the order of release and this should hopefully get you on your way back home.

You know that -- you have gone through the extradition; that is done, and when you have court, you are going to need to show up.

THE DEFENDANT: Don't worry.

THE COURT: All right.

Anything further, Ms. Woo?

MS. WOO: No, Your Honor.

MR. PLATT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Mr. Platt? All right. Mr.

Rosenau, good luck.

THE CLERK: Your Honor, we are off record.

(End of proceedings for 5/4/2011)

USA v. Henry C. Rosenau - CR 06-157 MJP - (5/4/2011)- P. 25 CERTIFICATE I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter. /Brian J. Killgore/ November 9, 2011 AAERT Certified Electronic Court Reporter & Transcriber License CERT\*D-498 ACE Reporting Services, Inc. 720 Queen Anne Ave. N. #311 Seattle, WA 98109 (206) 467-6188